

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,911	05/23/2001	Steven Shepley	D-1140	1612
28995 7590 02/16/2007 RALPH E. JOCKE walker & jocke LPA			EXAMINER	
			HESS, DANIEL A	
231 SOUTH BROADWAY MEDINA, OH 44256			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		·	2876	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		ناري. ا			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office A-4's CO	09/863,911	SHEPLEY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Daniel A. Hess	2876			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some and the provided patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (R. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report of the complex of the	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	23 May 2001.				
· _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·				
3) Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal matt	ters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction at	nd/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 23 May 2001 is/are		cted to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. {	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received in A	Application No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have been	received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bu	ıreau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies not	received.			
Attachment(s)	 □	C			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of	Informal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [] Other:	·			

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to Applicant's filing of 5/23/2001, which has been entered into the electronic file of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Re claim 1: The precise scope and meaning of "Open Device Services" is not clear from the claim. Whereas "XFS" is an industry-standard term, "ODS" is a term that the Applicant appears to have coined. As the claim now reads, the ODS layer does not serve any special function (other than to be an intermediate layer).

In the specification on the other hand, the ODS layer is described as having a specific role, as conveyed on page 8, lines 7-14:

"The ODS layer is operative to route the terminal application commands through the correct XFS layer. Those devices that include WOSA/XFS service provider interfaces will have

Application/Control Number: 09/863,911

Art Unit: 2876

corresponding ODS components that are operative to communicate with the WOSA/XFS

Manager. Those devices that include J/XFS device services will have corresponding ODS

components that are operative to communicate with the J/XFS Kernel. In a further alternative

embodiment, each ODS component is operative to communicate with either XFS layer depending

on ODS configuration parameters which specify which XFS layer each ODS component should

use to communicate with devices."

The role, function and action of the ODS layer needs to be clarified in the claims. If the claim were read from the view that the ODS layer does not serve any special function, then what is left is the interaction between the XFS layer and the device driver layer, which has already been admitted to be old in the specification. That is clearly not the intent of the Applicant.

Claims 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Re claims 21 and 26: The reasons for this rejection are similar to the reasons for rejection of claim 1, above.

The precise scope and meaning of "Open Device Services" is not clear from the claim. Whereas "XFS" is an industry-standard term, "ODS" is a term that the Applicant appears to have coined. As the claim now reads, the ODS layer does not serve any special function (other than to be an intermediate layer).

In the specification on the other hand, the ODS layer is described as having a specific role, which needs to be clarified in the claims. If the claim were read from the view that the

Art Unit: 2876

ODS layer does not serve any special function, then what is left is the interaction between the XFS layer and the device driver layer, which has already been admitted to be old in the specification. That is clearly not the intent of the Applicant.

Remarks

The Examiner wishes to convey that if the omitted elements and methods were included in the independent claims in a satisfactory way, the Examiner would be strongly inclined to allow the case.

The prior art fails to teach or fairly convey a transaction machine or method according to any of the independent claims, wherein (including all the language now existing in the independent claims), the ODS layer is operative to route the terminal application commands through the correct XFS layer such that those devices that include WOSA/XFS service provider interfaces will have corresponding ODS components that are operative to communicate with the WOSA/XFS Manager while those devices that include J/XFS device services will have corresponding ODS components that are operative to communicate with the J/XFS Kernel.

Also the prior art fails to teach or fairly convey a transaction machine or method according to any of the independent claims, wherein (including all the language now existing in the independent claims), wherein each ODS component is operative to communicate with either XFS layer depending on ODS configuration parameters which specify which XFS layer (WOSA/XFS or J/XFS) each ODS component should use to communicate with devices.

The Applicant can feel free to contact the Examiner to confirm that particular claim language is satisfactory.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Two examples of where Extensions for Financial Services (XFS) libraries are employed in an ATM-type environment are Korala et al. (US 2003/0055876) and Antonin et al. (US 2002/0138446).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel A. Hess whose telephone number is (571) 272-2392. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/863,911

Art Unit: 2876

Page 6

Daniel A Hess Examiner

Art Unit 2876

2/10/2007